

intermediate part di-hyposthium  
etc in a few cases can only be justified  
if applied to all - and it is as difficult  
to say how much of the expansion  
beyond the ordinary thickness of the axis  
before it divides into separate petals etc  
or their lobes, or both is di-hyposthium  
etc. as distinguished from true calycete  
on the one side or from a thickened axis on  
the other. If no one settles all these points  
satisfactorily I intend trying my hand  
at it apropos of some Roraceae.

I certainly mean Ovary to be the ovule  
bearing portion of the pistil - but when  
we talk of a compound Ovary we mean  
an Ovary of several carpels the same  
as when we speak of a compound  
fruit - In general works the Ovary  
of Ranunculaceae <sup>like the parent</sup> is said to be apocarpous  
the one and the other is used in two  
senses a general and a partial one. This  
perhaps is not right and I should have  
said "sometimes ~~apocarpous~~" instead of  
"in general the word ovary is used to  
designate all the ovaries of a flower" I  
do not see how you can well avoid doing  
so in familiar like Apocynum where the  
carpels are either distinct or more or less  
combined.

I am reading a very long paper on the  
Siamese which I hope you will criticize  
without mercy

With kindest regards to Mr. Gray and  
many thanks for his letter believe me  
Ever yours most sincerely  
George Dontham

91 Victoria Street 80  
Westminster  
Nov 28 1850

My dear Gray

I have to thank you for one  
or two letters received since I returned  
to town - together with determination  
of Hong Kong etc Rubiaceae & Compositae  
I shall be very happy to send you  
my paper on Hong Kong plants  
as soon as I can finish it. For the  
present I am forced to lay it aside  
to finish the Oranilion Papilionaceae  
for Martius - A first part to  
the end of Phaseolus is printed and  
I believe will be out very shortly  
The plates are prepared & although I have no hand in them  
the text has taken me much more  
time than any I had any idea of as  
I have had to work up at the same  
time almost all South American  
Leguminosae and most Asiatic and  
African ones in order to acquire some  
fixed ideas as to the genera and species  
I find one gets quite wrong in establishing  
genera on the plants of one country  
without close comparison with others  
I have had to suppress or remodel many

of the Anacardiaceae genera I made at  
Vienna in 1836 - and you will readily  
see that Berg's American Myrtaceous  
genera clash very unharmoniously  
with Plum. & Wright's Acetate genera  
and subgenera - Berg has enormously  
multiplied species but he has worked  
better than some - and the forms of  
1. American Myrtles are really so  
numerous and so difficult to define  
that it will be a long while before  
any one comes to improve upon Berg  
- Griseb. means to be working now  
upon much better principles.

I am now hard at work at Dalbergiacae  
and hope to finish them and Lophocarp.  
in the course of January. I shall then  
take the Hong Kong Flora and finish  
that before I commence the  
Australasian Flora.

For. Hooker has shown me your  
review of my Handbook and I am  
much flattered by the compliments you  
pay me. I admit some of your  
criticisms but not all. The English  
Nomenclature is I know in many  
respects very unsatisfactory although  
I bestowed more time and thought

about it than the thing is worth -  
I could answer some of your objections  
Milford is *Aschellia melleoformis* Cotton  
Mulleth will not make one word like  
Rocherch - I cannot bring myself to  
call *Myrotilis verrucosa* a Forget-me-not  
which applies to one species only in this  
country - Gardeners never call the  
cultivated *M. sylvatica* etc Forget-  
me-nots - but I had better have left  
*Myrotilis*. I thought it worth while  
to shorten *Ceratium* as being very  
common but perhaps not - certainly  
not *Holostium* as it is thousands to  
one of any persons picking it up in  
England. I really want to shorten many  
more Latin names - others pool-pool  
the whole thing and I do not much like it

My definitions of perigynous and  
epigynous are not good but the whole  
nomenclature of inferior and superior  
hypogynous perigynous epigynous etc  
requires revision - I was going to say  
something on the subject in my paper  
now reading at the Linn. Soc. but I have  
not yet matured my views and reserve  
them for another occasion - the difficulty  
is to settle what is peduncle and receptacle  
(that is axis) and what is calyx petal Stam.  
etc. that is where does one begin & the  
other end - for the reverse of calling the